

Remarks

Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful consideration of the application. Claims 1 - 22 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1 – 5, 8, 11, 12, 15 and 16 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shahindoust (US Publication No. 2004/0190038 A1) (“Shahindoust”). Applicants canceled Claim 4 in a previous response. Applicants respectively traverse the remaining rejections.

In claim 1, Applicants recite a method for completing a print job. The method includes delivering at least one print job to a printing device, bringing a tag containing information to be incorporated into the print job into close proximity to the printing device so that the device receives the information from the tag, and incorporating the information received from the tag into the print job.

The Examiner should withdraw the rejection to claim 1 over Shahindoust as the Examiner has not shown that Shahindoust discloses, for example, incorporating information received from a tag into a print job. The Examiner asserts this limitation is shown in lines 17 – 28 of Shahindoust. However, this passage appears to only disclose using information contained on a tag for authentication only. The Examiner has not identified any passage where information from a tag is incorporated into a print job. Therefore, the Examiner should withdraw the rejection to claim 1.

The Examiner should allow claims 2 – 5, 8, 11, and 12 if claim 1 is allowed as claims 2 – 5, 8, 11, and 12 depend from claim 1.

In claim 15, Applicants recite a method for transferring documents from one location to another. The method includes sending at least one document to be transferred to the queue of a device having document transmission capabilities, bringing an electronic tag containing information in close proximity to a tag reader operably connected to the device having document transmission capabilities so that the tag may

be read and information is received by the device. Finally, using the information received from the tag to transmit the document.

The Examiner should withdraw the rejection to claim 15 over Shahindoust as the Examiner has not shown that Shahindoust discloses, for example, using information received from a tag to transmit a document. The passages cited by the Examiner appear to disclose using a Bluetooth enabled smart card to authenticate a user, but the passage in question does not appear to disclose using information on the Bluetooth smart cards to transmit a document. The Examiner contends that the Applicants have not provided an argument why the passage cited by the Examiner does not show this limitation. First, Applicants remind the Examiner that it is his burden to establish lack of novelty, not Applicants' duty to prove novelty. Second, the Examiner has not shown that the passage discloses using information received from a tag to transmit a document. Lines 18 – 28 of paragraph 17 appear to disclose an authentication method. In claim 15, Applicants explicitly recite that the information is used to transmit the document. Authentication is not the same as using information to complete a transmission. For the foregoing reasons the Examiner should allow claim 15 over Shahindoust.

The Examiner should allow claim 16 if claim 15 is allowed as claim 16 depends from claim 15.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 17-22 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shahindoust in view of well known prior art MPEP 2144.03. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 17 depends from claim 15 and further defines the information received by the document transmission device as including a destination email address that is used to transmit a document. As Applicants have previously argued, the Examiner has not established that Shahindoust discloses, for example, using

information received from a tag to transmit a document. Therefore, claim 17 should be allowed if claim 15 is allowed as claim 17 depends from claim 15.

Further, the Examiner has not shown transmitting a destination address to a document transmission device. The Examiner asserts this is well-known art, but Applicants are unaware of anyone using tags for this purpose. Paragraphs 24 and 26 of Applicants' application in no way suggests that the use of e-mails and the use of tag information to facilitate an e-mail instruction is well-known. Tags and badges with RF, optical, and other communication means and their use in interactive environments are well-known, but the Examiner has not established that transmitting e-mail addresses that are used to complete a document transmission is well-known. Therefore, Claim 17 should be allowable, regardless of the liability of claim 15.

In claim 18, Applicants recite a system for generating an advertisement. The system includes a tag encoded with advertising information, a tag reading device for reading the tag and receiving the advertising information therefrom, and an output device operably connected to the tag reading device, wherein the output device generates the advertisement.

The Examiner should withdraw the rejection to claim 18 over Shahindoust as the Examiner has not shown that Shahindoust discloses, for example, a tag encoded with advertising information or a tag reading device that receives the advertising information therefrom. As previously noted, the passages cited by the Examiner appear to merely disclose using a Bluetooth card for authentication purposes. The Examiner has not identified any portion of the application that appears to disclose using information stored on the Bluetooth card in a print job. Further, the Examiner has not pointed to any passage in Shahindoust that discloses using advertising information from a tag to produce an advertisement. Further, the Examiner has not shown a tag encoded with advertising information or a tag reading device that receives the advertising information therefrom. The Examiner provides no reason for why this information is obvious. The only support the Examiner provides is that the technology for reading tag information is well-known. The Examiner fails to argue how the ability to

read tag information leads to the inclusion of advertising information on a tag that is subsequently read and used to generate an advertisement. For each of the foregoing reasons claim 18 should be allowed.

The Examiner should allow claims 19 – 22 if claim 18 is allowed, as claims 19 – 22 depend from claim 18.

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 7, 9 and 10 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shahindoust in view Yajima et al. (US Publication No. 2002/0016833 A1) (“Yajima”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 6, 7, 9, and 10 depend from claim 1. As Applicants have previously argued, the Examiner has not established that Shahindoust discloses, for example, incorporating information received from a tag into a print job. The Examiner has not identified this limitation in Yajima either. Therefore, claims 6, 7, 9, and 10 should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed.

The Examiner rejected claims 13 and 14 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shahindoust in view of Harrison et al. (US Patent No. 6,249,226 B1) (“Harrison”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 1. As Applicants have previously argued, the Examiner has not established that Shahindoust discloses, for example, incorporating information received from a tag into a print job. The Examiner has not identified this limitation in Harrison either. Therefore, claims 13 and 14 should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed.

Conclusion

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment. However, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. This also constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and authorization to charge all fees therefor to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

Application No. 10/685,238

A telephone interview is respectfully requested at the number listed below prior to any further Office Action, i.e., if the Examiner has any remaining questions or issues to address after this paper. The undersigned will be happy to discuss any further Examiner-proposed amendments as may be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

/Joseph M. Young, Reg. No. 45248/

Joseph M. Young
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 45,248
Telephone (503) 685-4229
October 24, 2008

JMY/rh